UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,937	06/20/2006	Pavel Bokov	GRY-142US	2961
23122 RATNERPRES	7590 08/28/2007 STIA		EXAM	INER
POBOX 980	CE DA 10492 0090		DUDNIKOV, VADIM	
VALLEY FOR	VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3663	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	•	10/561,937	BOKOV ET AL.		
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Vadim Dudnikov	3663		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address		
		/ 10 0FT TO EVDIDE 4 MO	ANTHON OF THEFTY (OC) PAYO		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS INSTRUCTION OF THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 36(a). In no event, however, may a repvill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	•				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Ju	<u>ıne 2007</u> .			
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar	•	•		
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 13-23 is/are pending in the application	n.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.			
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.				
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>13-23</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according to	epted or b)⊡ objected to b	y the Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyand	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s	i) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).		
-,	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.	·		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		plication No.		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	• •		
	application from the International Bureau	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•		
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not r	eceived.		
Attachmer	• •				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ımmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date		
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P1O-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		formal Patent Application		

Application/Control Number: 10/561,937

Art Unit: 3663

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

This application was filed under 35 U.S.C. 371. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C.

121 and 372.

1. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic

invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so

linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

I. Neutron generation by proton beam (in claims 16, 17, 21, 22);

II. Neutron generation by electron beam (claim 18).

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive

concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or

corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the general inventive

concept set forth, for example, in claims such as claim 18, does not define over the

teachings of the prior art set forth, for example, in Krakowski ("Accelerator transmutation

of Waste Economics, Nucler Technology 110 (1995)).

Application/Control Number: 10/561,937 Page 3

Art Unit: 3663

If species I is elected applicant is further required under PCT Rule 13.1 to elect one 2.

of the following subspecies for spallation targets.

The subspecies are as follows:

Subspecies A: spallation target with buffer (claim 22);

Subspecies B: Spallation target without buffer (claim 21).

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

5. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following

manner:

Species I recited in claims 16-17, 21-22;

Species II recited in claim 18;

Application/Control Number: 10/561,937 Page 4

Art Unit: 3663

Subspecies A recited in claim 22;

Subspecies B recited in claim 21.

The following claim(s) are generic: claim 13 and claim 19.

The **sub**species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: because the special technical feature of subspecies A is having a buffer for the spallation target, while the special technical feature of subspecies species B is having no buffer for the spallation target. Since the special technical feature of subspecies A is not present in the claims drawn to subspecies B, and the special technical feature of subspecies B is not present in the claims drawn to subspecies A, unity of invention is lacking.

7. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

Art Unit: 3663

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 8. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vadim Dudnikov whose telephone number is 571 270
 The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571 272 6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

Application/Control Number: 10/561,937

Art Unit: 3663

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Examiner

Vadim Dudnikov,

August 22, 2007.

Primary Examiner:

(8/25/07)

Tohannes Mondt

(TC3600, Art Unit 3663)

Page 6